

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10-12, 17-20, and 27 are pending in the subject application.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 17-19. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smart et al.* (“*Smart*”) (US 2003/0208691 A1) in view of *Kuwata et al.* (“*Kuwata*”) (US 2002/0030833 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1 and 17-19, as amended herein.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to specify that the extension tag corresponding to the extended function is inserted into the script in the case where it is confirmed that the extended function is executable (in both the digital camera and the printer), and the extension tag is not inserted into the script in the case where it is confirmed that the extended function is not executable. Applicants’ specification provides support for the changes made to claim 1 (see, for example, Figure 15 and the accompanying description thereof in the specification). Applicants have amended each of independent claims 17-19 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended.

In formulating the obviousness rejection of claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that the *Smart* reference “fails to teach connecting directly a digital camera and a printer via a USB cable.” Final Office Action at page 5. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner asserts that the *Kuwata* reference discloses connecting directly a digital camera and a printer via a USB cable, and concludes that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a digital camera connected directly to a printer via a USB cable in the process of

Smart. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position regarding the alleged obviousness of the claimed subject matter.

The *Smart* reference discloses the processing required for preventing confidential documents from being read by unauthorized persons when printing the confidential documents from a network printer. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have any reasonable motivation to modify the configuration shown by *Smart* so that the digital camera and the printer are directly connected via a USB cable. As such, the *Kuwata* reference, which discloses a technique for optimally reproducing an image at an output device, would not have guided one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the configuration shown by *Smart* in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Consequently, the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claim 1 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Each of independent claims 17-19 has been amended to include features that correspond to those specified in present claim 1. As such, the arguments set forth above regarding present claim 1 also apply to present claims 17-19.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 17-19, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata*. Claims 10 and 20, each of which depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smart* in view of *Kuwata*, and further in view of *Okada* (US 6,980,699 B1). Each of claims 11 and 12 ultimately depends from claim 1 (via claim 10). The deficiencies of the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1 are discussed above in connection with the

obviousness rejection of claim 1. The *Okada* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Smart* and *Kuwata* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 12 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* and *Okada* for at least the reason that each of these claims ultimately depends from claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Smart* in view of *Kuwata*, and further in view of *Fukasawa* (US 2002/0140952 A1). Claim 27 depends from claim 1. The deficiencies of the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1 are discussed above in connection with the obviousness rejection of claim 1. The *Fukasawa* reference does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of the *Smart* and *Kuwata* references relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claim 27 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Smart* in view of *Kuwata* and *Fukasawa* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 10-12, 17-20, and 27, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. NGBCP003).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "P. B. Martine", with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920